

## REMARKS

Claims 8, 11-14 and 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a), as being anticipated by Applicant's Admitted Prior Art (APA). Although the prior art teaches that ceramic designs may be created on a metal surface by coating the metal surface with a ceramic metal marking layer and then reacting portions of the layer with a laser, the prior art does not teach bending metal so marked to form a bracelet. It was not obvious, at the time the present invention was reduced to practice, that the reacted design on the metal surface would remain undamaged and intact during the bending process, as the outer surface on a piece of sheet metal that is being bent is stretched, while the inner surface is compressed. It is believed that the present inventor was the first to bend laser-marked sheet metal to create jewelry and body ornaments, such as bracelets. Although it would be possible to bend the metal and then mark it, such a process would require highly specialized equipment to rotate the bent metal while the metal is being subjected to a laser beam. The process disclosed in the present application is certainly not anticipated by the prior art, as the prior art does not show the ordered steps of cutting, laser marking, and bending a piece of sheet metal. The rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) is therefore inappropriate and unsubstantiated.


Claims 9, 22, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30-33 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(b) as being unpatentable over various combinations of the APA and the issued patent references of Robertson, Barr, Shapiro. None of these references teaches the steps of cutting, laser marking, and bending a piece of sheet metal. In addition, as stated above, it was not obvious when the present invention was reduced to practice, that a reacted design on a metal surface would remain undamaged and intact during the bending process, as the outer surface on a piece of sheet metal that is being bent is stretched, while the inner surface is compressed. Thus, the rejections for obviousness are also inappropriate and unsubstantiated.

It is believed that the application and claims, as amended, of the present application are in a condition for allowance. Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

The foregoing is believed to be a full and complete response to the outstanding

Office Action.

Respectfully submitted,



Angus C. Fox, III  
Attorney of Record  
Registration No. 31,828